

Director of Central Intelligence
Security Committee
Computer Security Subcommittee

July 1981
DCISEC-CSS-M138

ILLEGIB

STAT

1. The one hundred and thirty-eighth meeting of the Computer Security Subcommittee was held on 14 July 1981 at [redacted] McLean, VA. The meeting was convened at 0930, and attending were:

STAT

STAT

[redacted] Executive Secretary
[redacted] CIA
Mr. James Studer, Army
Mr. Lynn McNulty, Dept. of State
Mrs. Hilda Faust Mathieu, NSA
[redacted] DIA
Mr. Lynn Culkowski, USAF
[redacted] CIA
[redacted] CIA

STAT

STAT

STAT

2. The minutes of the previous meeting were reviewed, and were accepted as written.

3. There was discussion of a requested observer status for a program management office at Dept. of State (ICA). The Subcommittee decided to reject the request on the grounds that such a group was clearly outside the community of interest.

STAT

4. The agreement at the previous meeting was that this meeting would be dedicated to a discussion of the basic policy statement of the DCID, and the meeting quickly got down to this issue. It was generally agreed that the policy should not get down to implementation details, but rather should provide a vehicle which provides sufficient latitude to allow the implementing organization to build systems which satisfy their operational requirements. It should, however, reflect any existing DCI policy regarding the handling of SCI. [redacted] stated that although he had no problem with a broad policy statement, he saw a need for the definition of the allowed modes of operation, as in the current version of the DCID. He stated that the definition of the allowed modes was particularly useful in his dealing with contractors. It was suggested that the application of the policy to contractors could be an implementation paper. The question of authority was discussed. The document must clearly delineate authority in three major areas; systems internal to the department or agency (i.e., authority to define requirements and to evaluate implementations), contractor systems, and community systems (contractor or U.S.-owned systems which serve several community members). It was also recognized that the scope of the authority must be defined, e.g., what are "ADP systems", are word processors included within the definition? The NSA member requested that specific shortcomings of the current DCID be documented so that the rewrite could remedy them. The immediate problems mentioned were the aspects of nonreleasability to contractors, and the ambiguity of the modes definition and application of those definitions.

STAT

5. The next meeting was scheduled for 0930 on 15 September 1981 at [redacted] McLean, VA. The members will be prepared to present comments to the proposed DCID rewrites distributed previously, present proposals for use of the CSS funds budgeted by the SECOM (see minutes for M-137), and be prepared to continue the discussion on the policy statement for the new DCID.

STAT

[redacted]
Executive Secretary